THEOLOGY

VOL. LIV OCTOBER, 1951 No. 376

Editorial

THE question is being mooted whether the Church of England should seek the help of the State in meeting the heavy expense of restoring and repairing the ancient parish churches. Tributes have deservedly been paid to the noble way in which the Church has been shouldering this burden. Large sums are constantly being raised by local enterprise for the restoration of churches, not least of village churches. It is, however, disagreeable to reflect upon the amount of time, energy, and ingenuity which has to be employed for this purpose and which otherwise might be employed on building living stones into a spiritual house (1 Pet. 2. 5). While efforts to restore their parish church may attach the parishioners more closely to it, yet it is doubtful whether their attendance upon divine service is much affected thereby. It is more important that the clergy and the faithful remnant should concentrate their attention upon winning new worshippers than upon repairing old buildings. And in so far as new funds must be raised by the Church, these are chiefly needed for the more adequate remuneration of its living agents and for the provision of buildings in new housing areas.

But is there some objection on ground of principle to the State's being invited to contribute to the repair of churches? We fail to see that there would be, if the assistance were sought and granted for the preservation of churches *qua* ancient national monuments, not *qua* places of worship. The buildings under consideration have this double character. The question is whether both Church and State would be prepared to recognize the distinction and to act upon it. The State has, of course, to be guided by what public opinion approves; but if what the Bishop of Peterborough says in his interesting booklet about his experiences as Rector of St Mary's, Southampton, is at all representative, no serious opposition from non-churchgoers is to be anticipated, but rather the contrary. A proposal was made to rebuild the parish church in another position. "This was hotly contested in Chapel, in bars and in other places of public resort . . . 'That's our church' . . . 'What do they mean by shifting it?' "[1]

The Government, under the Town and Country Planning Act, is in fact now concerning itself with the transmission to future generations of many kinds of building, and, in so far as churches are monuments of archaeological, architectural, or aesthetic value to the nation,

[1] Spencer Leeson, *The Parish Priest in Dockland* (Longmans, 3s.), p. 15; see also pp. 54 f.

the State and all its citizens have or ought to have an interest in their preservation. Let it be noted that this also holds for what used to be called the chapels of the Protestant and Catholic dissenters. When these buildings come into the category of national monuments, as some of them certainly do (though naturally only a small number in proportion), their preservation is also a fitting subject for the State's solicitude. Under the conditions which at present govern the relations of Church and State, it is only the fabric of ecclesiastical buildings which the State could properly be invited to subsidize; their furnishing and upkeep as places of worship must continue to be the sole responsibility of those who use them for that purpose.

We do not apprehend that the State would seek to exercise any control of the worship that goes on in churches and chapels as a condition of supplying financial help for the restoration of buildings; such a condition would certainly be unacceptable to the Church. On the other hand, the State would rightly seek assurances that its grants would be used wisely and to the best effect, and any conditions which ensured that the best available architectural authorities were always consulted should be welcomed. It goes without saying that ecclesiastical buildings so restored would be open to sightseers except during times of divine service. There is no reason why the State should require more than this. There are good precedents in this country for the State's making grants, e.g. to universities, without attempting to secure political control of what does not belong to the province of the civil government.

It seems therefore that there is no objection to ascertaining whether the State would be willing to contribute to the preservation of ancient churches and, if so, upon what conditions. No principle will be surrendered by an exploration of the question.

The Primacy of Praise

I

THERE are five points concerning the last end of man upon which, in the great tradition of Christian ascetical theology, there is substantial agreement. (1) Man's last end is union with God. (2) This union is to be conceived not in extrinsic but intrinsic terms; it consists not in contemplating or loving or serving God as an object exterior to ourselves, but in an activity which can be described only by such phrases as "possessing God", "being possessed by God", "living with the life of God", "being caught up into God". (In passing it must be remarked that all such phrases are highly analogical, since there is nothing else that is precisely like the condition which they are being used to describe.) (3) This union, although it is more profound and intimate than any other union of which we have experience, does not destroy either the createdness or the personal identity of those who enjoy it. (4) This union with God does not destroy, but intensifies, the union of the faithful with one another in

the Body of Christ; the life everlasting is the affirmation and the fulfilment, not the negation, of the communion of saints. (5) Although in its fulness this union will be enjoyed in heaven after the final resurrection, it is nevertheless really, though partially, accessible to us here and now: *gratia est nihil aliud quam quaedam inchoatio gloriae in nobis.*

When, however, we go beyond this and inquire in what this beatitude primarily consists, disagreement begins. I am not at the moment concerned with the question which has so violently divided Catholics and Protestants, the question whether the view of beatitude held by Catholic theologians, and in particular by Catholic mystics, is a virtual denial of man's creaturely status and a concession to pantheism; whether, for example, St John of the Cross was really only a Buddhist or a Hindu who had the misfortune to be born in sixteenth-century Spain. Nor am I concerned here with the question which has been argued between Western Catholic Thomists and Eastern Orthodox Palamites about the precise metaphysical doctrines which make it possible to conceive of a real communication of God to man which does not destroy man's creatureliness or his personal identity. I wish rather to discuss a question which has arisen within the tradition of Western Catholicism but which has wider ramifications and repercussions: the question of the primary formal constituent[1] of this union with God. Granted that in heaven we shall know God and love him, is it the knowledge of God or the love of God that fundamentally constitutes our beatitude? Or is it, perhaps, something else?

It is well known that this question gave rise in the medieval schools to a vigorous discussion which still goes on in scholastic circles. On the one side, the Thomist Dominicans, with their celebrated intellectualist bias, identified the primary constituent of beatitude with the *knowledge* of God; they could appeal for support to the dominical promise that the pure in heart are blessed since they shall see God, and the very phrase "Beatific *Vision*", which has become the accepted technical term to designate the heavenly activity of the blessed, shows how preponderant the Thomist view has been. (It must be remembered that, for Thomists, sight is the most exalted of the five senses and most closely approximates to the immateriality of intellection; it therefore provides the least inadequate image of a purely intellectual activity.) On the other side, the Bonaventuran Franciscans taught that it is the *love* of God in which beatitude primarily consists, and they could with some cogency invoke the impressive authority of St Augustine; we may remember that Mr John Burnaby's great study of Augustinian spirituality bears the title *Amor Dei*, "The Love of God". Neither side, of course, denied that beatitude includes both knowledge and love; the question was which of the two was primary. The Thomist argument was that you cannot love what you do not know, and therefore, in the life of

[1] I must make it plain that "constituent" in this context does not mean a *component* or an integral *part*, but a constitutive principle or activity. Any suggestion of quasi-spatial juxtaposition must be ruthlessly excluded.

heaven, the knowledge which the blessed have of God must be logically and metaphysically prior to the love with which they love him; but they never asserted that you can come to the full knowledge of God in heaven unless you have loved him first on earth. The Franciscans, on the other hand, were mission preachers by vocation and philosophers only, as it were, by accident. They naturally appealed to the emotions rather than to the mind, and when they did appeal to the mind it was to the will rather than to the intellect; their emotional and voluntarist emphasis led them as a matter of course to see beatitude as consisting primarily in the love, rather than in the knowledge, of God.

I shall not be so rash as to try to settle this quarrel of the schools, which in any case, as is clear from M. Gilson's magisterial work on St Bonaventure, is quite as much a clash between two different philosophical systems as between two different views about the end of man. What I shall have the temerity to do—and I should like to emphasize that I am putting forward a suggestion for discussion and not making a profession of faith—is to point out that both views raise serious difficulties and to suggest that, at any rate from one aspect, it is neither knowledge nor love that is primary, but something else.

Both the Thomist and the Franciscan views get into difficulties over the question of disinterestedness. It has often been urged against the Thomist view that, if beatitude consists primarily in knowing God, it is really fundamentally selfish. Heaven will consist in enjoying ourselves, even if we are enjoying ourselves in enjoying God. For to know something is to possess it for your own contemplation, to feed upon it intellectually, to clasp it to yourself, to draw it into your mind. It is to make the object *your own*, and this remains true even when you have invoked the Aristotelian principle that the mind becomes *intentionaliter* what it knows. Love, in contrast, we are told, is essentially outgoing and disinterested; only if beatitude consists primarily in *loving* God can it be free from all taint of egoism.

At this point, however, another chorus of voices raises its protest. Can even love be disinterested in this sense, at any rate so long as we are thinking of the love which man can exercise and not the love which God exercises, the love which *is God*? At least twice in the history of Western Christendom the very possibility of disinterested love has been called in question. This happened in the twelfth century in the famous dispute between Abelard and St Bernard. Bernard, with that sturdy realism which so often characterizes the great saints, insisted that, since our love for God in fact makes us eternally happy and since we know that it does, to demand that we shall love God without regard for our eternal happiness is to demand a psychological impossibility. Even in heaven we are bound to love ourselves, even if paradoxically we can be described as loving ourselves for the sake of God. Furthermore, since it is God's will that we shall be eternally happy, to be indifferent to our eternal happiness would be to be indifferent to the fulfilment of God's will. And

to be indifferent to the fulfilment of God's will would be a queer way of manifesting our love for God. Abelard, however, with the uncompromising ruthlessness of the penitent sinner, would have no such truckling with the *phronema sarkos*, even in a sublimated form; unless I love God without consideration of my own happiness, I am not loving God at all, but only myself. M. Gilson has made the penetrating suggestion that Abelard's position is the direct outcome of his tragic affair with Heloise. Abelard, he points out, was full of remorse for the ruin which his passion had brought upon the unhappy partner of his sin, though it might well appear that he had suffered for it more than she had. Heloise herself, with a noticeably feminine tendency to dramatize and romanticize the situation, was never tired of insisting that both her initial lapse and her subsequent renunciation were entirely the result of her concern for Abelard's happiness, and Abelard, with masculine simplicity, was only too ready to believe her. What, then, does his doctrine of the disinterested love of God really come to in the end? Simply this, says Gilson: that a man must love God not as Abelard loved Heloise, but as Heloise loved Abelard. No wonder that this was more than St Bernard could stomach!

The second resurgence of the controversy was in the seventeenth century, between Bossuet and Fénelon. Here it was the saintly Fénelon who was the champion of disinterested love and the rather more worldly Bossuet who opposed him. But I think it would be generally admitted that, if the saintly Fénelon had a fault, it was a rather fastidious preciosity.

But now the windows are thrown wide open by the Protestants, who let in the icy blast of Lutheranism. What, they demand, is this nonsense about man loving God with a purely disinterested love? Not only is such a love a psychological impossibility, but even were it possible it would be valueless. The only unselfish love is God's love for man; that is the only *agape* that there is. To speak of man exercising *agape* towards God—this is simply justification by works in its most outrageous and insidious form. God has love towards man, yes. And let man have *faith* towards God—that will justify him. But that man should have love towards God—this is nothing but the rankest Catholicism. You will not find it in St Paul, says Nygren, and if St John was unfortunately under the influence of it and so infected Christendom for fifteen centuries with a heresy from which even the great Augustine, that former idol of Protestants, was not wholly free, the true Pauline doctrine re-emerged with Luther. So let us hear no more about man loving God. Did Luther write two million words for nothing?

What does the Protestant protest really show? That man cannot love God with a purely disinterested love? Yes, I think so. That if he could, such a love would not, by itself, justify him, and that still less can he be justified by the selfish love which he has? Yes, perhaps so, again. But that, being justified by the blood of Christ, it is wrong for him to love God and to enjoy God? That, I think, does not follow. Nevertheless, we have, I think, seen at least that the notion

of love is a very complex and ambivalent one, and that to say that either knowing God or loving God is the *primary* constituent of man's beatitude raises some real problems.

II

We may get closer to the heart of the matter by asking another question. What is the *utility* of either knowing God or loving him? Of course, while we are in this earthly life, both these activities have the instrumental utility of helping us to get to heaven. But when we have arrived there, what is their utility then? Are we to love God because it does him good, because it adds to his happiness? That surely is impossible. How can anything that finite beings can do add to the beatitude which the Ever-blessed Trinity enjoys in his perfect life of consubstantial triune love? You say, perhaps, that God wants us to be happy and that if we are happy this will make him happy too; that in this way, if in no other, we can add to God's happiness. But, even so, our activity cannot contribute anything that is *qualitatively* different from what God already possesses; all finite activity is only an infinitely reduced version of some aspect of the infinite activity which is God. And if you say that its contribution is a *quantitative* one, what *can* anything finite add quantitatively to God's absolute infinity? We must recall the scholastic adage that creation brings into being *plura entia* but not *plus entis*. It looks, in short, as if we shall have to say that all the *utility* of our beatitude belongs to us and not to God; it is of no *use* to him, even if it is what he wills. He wills it not for his good, but for ours.

This I believe to be strictly true, but we cannot leave the question there. For if we do we shall apparently be making man and not God the final end of man's creation. The theologian's way out of the impasse is to say that, although God wills both our creation and our enjoyment of the beatific vision for our *utility* and not for his, he wills them for his *glory* and not for ours. This again I believe to be true, but the distinction is one whose validity it is not easy to make convincing. The Catholic would seem to be in much the same fix about utility and glory that the Protestant is in about faith and works. How are you to make *faith* a human act without its becoming a *work*? And how can you maintain that God's *glory* is the true end of the existence and the activity of his creatures unless you can demonstrate that glory is somehow *useful*? Can we, in fact, establish this distinction between glory and utility as one that has any real meaning?

One way of trying to avoid this difficulty is to point out that, although loving and knowing God do in fact constitute our ultimate happiness, this is not the *reason* for our loving and knowing God. (At least this would be maintained about *loving* God, and the Bonaventurans might urge this as showing the superiority of their view over that of the Thomists.) Loving God may be for our utility, but it is for his glory; and it is God's glory and not their own utility that the blessed will. This rejoinder does not, I think, really

come to grips with the question, which is how anything which has not utility can be significantly willed as an end. This question will, so far as I can see, be convincingly answered only if we can point to some specific rational activity which everyone must recognize as valid and significant, and which nevertheless is not willed because of its utility and indeed may in some cases be of no utility at all. I do not think love will meet the case (at any rate as exercised by a finite being), for, as we saw in considering the controversy about disinterested love, love contains an essential duality. I do not think it is possible for a finite being to love another being with a purely disinterested love, simply because the more the lover succeeds in making the beloved happy, the more he will be conscious of the happiness that he is enjoying as a result of the beloved's happiness. (God's love for us is, of course, different, for in loving us God is aware that our happiness *cannot* add anything to the happiness which he already enjoys, and so he *can* love us for our sake alone.) Furthermore, in so far as love *is* concerned with the beloved and not with the lover, it is concerned with his welfare; it seeks to be of *utility* to him. Love, therefore, seems to me to fall short on two counts of what is required in the *primary* formal constituent of man's ultimate beatific activity; it is not concerned solely with its object but also with its subject, and it is not concerned solely with glory but also with utility. What we are seeking is some rational activity which *is* concerned solely with its object and which at the same time is concerned not to be of utility to its object but to give him glory. Love, I have suggested, will not do. Still less will knowledge, for knowledge, as such, is entirely concerned with the perfection of the knower and not with either the welfare or the glory of the object known. Our problem, then, reduces to this: Can we find some activity which man can exercise towards God and which, while it is solely concerned with God and not with man, is nevertheless concerned not to be useful to God but simply to offer him glory? I think that we can, but before trying to do so I must make it perfectly clear, if I have not already done so, that, when we say that the glory of God is the sufficient reason for a creature's activity, although that activity is of no utility to God, we are denying altogether that the final end of human activity is to be thought of in terms of utility. So long as we allow ourselves to remain under the domination of economic categories we can make sense of any activity, whether God's or man's, only by arguing that it is somehow or other useful; and that is to deny altogether the validity of glory as an end distinct from utility. When, on the other hand, we assert that the glory of God provides a sufficient reason for man's activity towards him, *although* nothing that man does can be of any utility to God, we are denying outright that in these matters the categories of economics apply. Or, if you like, we are denying that the divine economics are utilitarian. This will be a scandal to the mercantile mind, but it may bring a great sense of liberation to human beings. In short, in order to provide a rational ground for man's ultimate relation to God, we have not to prove that it is *useful*, but only that it is *fitting*.

III

I come, therefore, to my positive suggestion, and I would emphasize again that it is only a suggestion. It is that the primary formal constituent of our final beatific state is neither the love of God nor the knowledge of God, but the *praise* of God. The sole justification for praising God is that God is praiseworthy. We do not praise him because it does us good, although no doubt it does. And we do not praise him because it does him good, because in fact it does not. Praise is thus strictly *ecstatic*, in the sense that it takes us wholly out of ourself; it is purely and solely directed upon God. People have tried to attribute this ecstatic character to love, but, as we have seen, the attempt breaks down over the question of disinterestedness. So long as we are merely *loving* God, the fatal duality of love comes in. We cannot separate loving God for his sake from loving him for our own sake. And in so far as we do succeed in loving God for his sake we are in danger of falling into the snare of supposing that we are conferring some benefit upon God, and that is an impossibility. We had far better admit frankly that in loving God we are—and are meant to be—loving him for our sake. It is altogether different with praise. Praise is entirely directed upon God; it takes our attention entirely off ourself and concentrates it entirely upon him. It neither does God any good, nor does it profess to do so. Its sole and sufficient justification lies in the fact that God is praiseworthy. And that is all the justification that it needs. I would add that the way in which we can most profitably purge our love of God from self-centredness is not by assaying the impossible task of achieving a purely disinterested love of God, but by infusing our love with praise.

In case this conclusion seems paradoxical, I will reinforce it with an illustration from ordinary life. When we are caught up in admiration of a great work of art or of a beautiful natural object, what is our justification for being thus occupied? Not that the contemplation of it does us good, though it may well do so. And not that it does the object of our contemplation any good, for it does not. I do not say "What a lot of good it is doing me to admire that picture!" It is only second-rate works of art that produce that kind of reaction. What I say is, "How splendid that picture is!" And that is sufficient. I think the same is true about our admiration of a noble human action. It may improve our character to admire it, but that is not what we admire it for. We admire it because it is admirable. In practice, of course, we can only approximate to this state of affairs, and this for two reasons. First, because few, if any, finite beings are *entirely* admirable; there are nearly always some flaws in their perfection. And, secondly, because, in this life at least, we seldom or never admire without doing something more. But with these qualifications, the illustration may hold. We admire things simply because they are admirable, and the question "What good does admiring them do?" is altogether beside the point.

I am not, of course, denying that it is right to love either finite beings or God, but only that loving them can ever be entirely dis-

interested. I do, on the other hand, assert that praise can be. And I think it is not irrelevant to observe that, even on the human level, love at its highest is always caught up in praise. This is what transfigures all great Christian love-poetry, as for example that of Dante or, in our own day, of Gilbert Keith Chesterton. And it is singularly lacking in the *Vivamus, mea Lesbia, atque amemus* of the pagan Catullus.

Praise, then, I suggest, has primacy over both knowledge and love, though it may include and transform them both. For praise is of no utility and is concerned solely with glory. *Gloria,* writes St Thomas, *est clara notitia cum laude.* And even in our earthly worship it is the praise of God that is primary, though people try constantly to evade the issue by urging either that worship does them good, which is totally irrelevant, or else that it confers some benefit upon God, which is totally untrue. *Gloria Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto . . . Te Deum laudamus, te Dominum confitemur . . .* And the glimpses that Scripture gives us of the worship of heaven are always a revelation of praise. Isaiah's vision in the temple, the song of the angels at Bethlehem, the celestial liturgy in the fourth chapter of the Apocalypse, all tell the same story. *Gloria in excelsis Deo . . .* "Worthy art thou, our Lord and our God, to receive glory and honour and power . . ."

It might perhaps be objected that, in arguing as I have for the inadequacy of love or knowledge to be the primary formal constituent of our final activity, I have neglected the fact that all the terms and concepts which we can use in this connexion are highly analogical. It might be said, for example, that the characteristics of love which I have alleged as disqualifying it for this position—its duality, the impossibility of its complete disinterestedness, its only partially ecstatic nature—attach only to its exercise *in via* and are not essential to it; they belong to the *modus significandi,* not to the *perfectio significata.* I think there is a good deal of force in this objection. It is perfectly true that the more nearly their designata are related to God himself, the more closely the terms of our human speech approximate in their significance to one another. (The supreme example of this is of course to be found in the common Thomist doctrine that, while the divine attributes are *formally* in God, their distinction from one another is not formal but *virtual.*) I would certainly admit that knowledge, love and praise are (if the phrase may be allowed) more *like one another* when their object is God than when their object is a creature. And I certainly would not say that love *as such* cannot be disinterested, for God's love for us certainly is. I am, however, very doubtful whether *our* love can ever be completely disinterested, even when its object is God and when the place where it is exercised is heaven. I would in any case recall my earlier remark that I am suggesting a thesis for discussion and not making a profession of faith. But I would at least maintain that if anyone is to hold that either love or knowledge is the primary formal constituent of our final activity, he must recognize that this love or knowledge is very much more like praise that is any love or

knowledge that we exercise on earth; it must in fact be love or knowledge infused with and transfigured by praise, *laude formata*. So long as this fundamental fact is admitted, there may well be room for difference of opinion as to the best words to describe an activity and a state which are vastly different from our present activity and state, even although in a sense continuous with them.

There is one more point on which I must touch. In postulating the praise of God as the primary formal constituent of our beatitude, I might seem to be making our last end consist in a purely extrinsic attitude and relation to God. This, however, is not so. For how do the blessed in fact praise God? Not by an atomized and morcellated exercise of their own individual activities, but by being caught up into union with Christ. The archetype of all praise is to be found within the Holy Trinity, in the eternal filial response of the divine Word to the Father. By the incarnation of the divine Word in the womb of Mary, that filial character is communicated to the human nature which he assumed. And by our incorporation into him it is communicated to us. The faithful therefore praise God by participating in the very act by which the Word eternally praises the Father; imperfectly *in via*, perfectly *in patria*. We praise God, not by standing over against him as it were, and regarding him from outside, but by being admitted into his very life.

Finally, I would appeal, in support of my approach, to the authority of St Augustine, and it was in fact from him that I derived the thought on which this paper is based. In the last chapter of the last book of the *De Civitate Dei*, describing the eternal felicity of the City of God and the perpetual sabbath, he writes: *Ibi vacabimus et videbimus, videbimus et amabimus, amabimus et laudabimus. Ecce quod erit in fine sine fine.* Vision leads on to love, but love itself leads on to praise. And again in one of his sermons he writes *Tota actio nostra Amen et Alleluja erit . . .* "There our food will be Alleluja, our drink will be Alleluja, the activity of our rest will be Alleluja, our whole joy will be Alleluja, that is, the Praise of God."[1]

E. L. Mascall, O.G.S.

The Gospel, Women, and the Church—II

The discussion of this problem challenges the Church and her members to ponder anew the mystery of God's grace in creation and redemption. But there are always those who come to rest upon the so-called "practical" problems.[2] For the Christian, of course, such distinction between theory and practice is heretical. If the Word of God be incarnate, if the Word has become flesh, theory and practice

[1] *Serm.*, cclii.

[2] Reference should be made to p. 26 of the account of Archbishop Brilioth's charge as Primate of Sweden in Theology, January 1951, vol. xiv, No. 367. "He founded his opinions [against the ordination of women] not on scriptural reasons, but on *practical* and irenic arguments." (The italics belong to the writer of this article.)

as spirit and flesh are forever to be held together. The practical areas of life, of economics, of technics and techniques, of administration and government, are the sacraments through which the will of God and the Spirit of his love work. Yet how "dead" may these works become if the Spirit fail! This truth, so fundamental and yet so obvious, women have a particular opportunity of understanding. So much of their family and domestic existence succeeds only if this be recognized. The housewife who may be excellent as housewife yet may be a poor wife or mother just because of her "good works", which for her may be bondage or self-love. Our Lord's rebuke to Martha always is relevant; yet Mary, who had chosen "the better part", may have been a slattern in household economy. So in our incarnate existences we strive to relate the quickening spirit of the Gospel to the flesh of our common life and order in the world as in the Church.

What, then, are these practical problems which might attend a possible widening of the Church's understanding of and charity towards women? One of the persistent arguments is that any such movement would endanger the probability of relations with the See of Rome. This argument in the year of grace 1951 after so many pronouncements of dogma seems so historically irrelevant as to be perverse. Yet, apart from historical considerations, it is hard to see logical grounds for argument. If such a move to recognize women as human beings be considered, much less acted upon, surely it must be considered on the grounds of its rightness as such, not because it might be, politically, a good or useful move or the reverse?

Other practical questions usually mentioned are those relating to woman's biological function. It is assumed that woman, because ordained to bear and rear children, cannot carry the responsibility of a full-time and full-term "job". Yet the witness of the professions and of the business world shows us women who have so responded to vocational interests that they have served nobly and competently in the world and at home. There is the fact of the years of childbearing and rearing for the married woman which is both destiny and opportunity. During these years, however, interests and even the continuation of study and preparation need not be ignored. Later on, when children are older and not only more independent, but need to be released from the exclusive care of mother and home, fuller participation in outside work not only is possible, but also is indicated for the fuller health and expression of the woman herself. Even a casual glance at the fields of education, government, medicine, law, and business, shows us women whose contribution to society is outstanding, and who yet have families and homes which are happy and healthy. In many of these cases it is the very sharing between man and wife of responsibility for home and children, and the due taking of thought for the better ordering of their common life, which has made for the outstanding achievement.

A few examples from professional circles in Great Britain and the United States should be mentioned. A woman physician with two children is married to the principal of a college. The dean of a

women's college whose husband is a child specialist has five children. The lady editor of a weekly journal, mother of two, is married to a research sociologist. A university teacher of political science, with three children, has a lawyer husband. The head of a famous settlement house has an editor husband.

Two points should be noticed in connexion with this brief list of representative examples. Education, social and academic, medicine and social administration are fields where professional, or rather vocational, dedication is demanded. The fact that women such as those mentioned above have sought to discharge their sense both of calling and of social responsibility by their continued relationship to their fields of work is evidence not to be passed over lightly by anyone concerned with the role of women in our society to-day. It is always a temptation for the Christian to think that "charity begins at home", and there to stop. For many women professedly Christian the teaching of the Church too often has suggested that charity both begins and ends at home. Woman's natural concern being with the family, it is all too easy for her sympathies to be circumscribed. The words of our Lord in the Gospel, "If ye love them that love you, what thank have ye? For even sinners love those that love them",[1] come to woman, to domestic woman, with particular force. Therefore, the example of women like those described above must be noticed in this respect. By the arrangements and economy of family life they have sought to discharge their "double" calling—as wives and mothers, and as responsible citizens of the historic order.

Another point must be emphasized. The fields of service from which these examples are taken all demand practical training and experience in personal relationships. Where is such training and experience better gained than in the deep and intimate relationships of family life, and in the associations of that family to the larger groups and wider loyalties of social life? Such practical training may not be after the pattern of pastoral training or regulated field work offered to ordinands or trainees for social work or education, yet the end of this truly "educational" process presumably is the same. The Christian wife and mother has to understand the needs of personalities within the structure of family life, and has to know how to relate details and duties, her own as well as theirs, to their individual needs and demands. She has to ponder the economy of family life, the true *οἰκονομία*, and to discern what are the real goods and riches thereof. The crises of personal decisions, of choices affecting the health and happiness of others; the problem of weighing methods and values; the temptation to tithe mint and cummin and to forget the weightier things of the law—all these familiar aspects of the Christian vocation and ministry are also ever-present to women who minister to their family, and who seek to serve their Lord through that ministry. What better training for the life of the Christian minister? Many women who prepared themselves for professional life in medicine, law, or education, or for other kinds of

[1] Luke 6. 32.

social or literary work, have, after marriage, devoted themselves to their families. Some are able to continue in some relation to their professional work. Others bring professional knowledge, interests, or skill to their family life, but from the point of view of exact occupations are completely "domestic". Yet such women have taken up their serious professional work with outstanding success after twelve or fifteen years of domestic preoccupation. Is the Church the one "institution" which denies to women the privilege of offering the experience and training won through the fulfilment of their God-given nature and function?

In a day when increasingly men of mature years and varied experience seek ordination through a deep sense of calling, it is inappropriate as well as wasteful to deny the like privilege of service, or rather the full recognition of that service, to women who not only have had long training, but also have served a practical apprenticeship at home as well as in the world.

There is also the fact of the single woman, and her service to the Church. Again, the fields of education, social work, and medicine, show countless women who have expressed vocationally their particular womanly gifts which for the married woman are turned to the care of family and home. The Church always has offered opportunities to the single woman who wished to offer her life to the service of God and his children. If *vocatio* in the middle ages for women as for men meant exclusively the calling of the cloister, at least women were accorded the possibility of that calling. It is rather depressing to contrast the lack of notable religious women in historic Protestantism, even in Anglicanism, against the roll of earlier Christendom with the names of noble and devout women such as St Catherine, St Theresa of Avila, St Hilda, and countless others. The revival of religious orders for women within the Anglican communion during the last hundred years has restored to women at least this opportunity of vocation.

The revival of the ancient order of Deaconesses, however, raises other problems. This office cannot be equated with the diaconate for men. Indeed, it has been necessary to emphasize this distinction, as the contrary assumption might have been made.[1] This Dr C. M. Ady also pointed out in her book on *The Role of Women in the Church*.[2] Thus, the deaconess, however superior in endowment or sacrificial in service, is an "extra" or a footnote to the regular ministry of the Church. In a pamphlet published by the Executive Committee of the National Conference of Deaconesses of the Protestant Episcopal Church in U.S.A., this is stated explicitly:

[1] "This office is primarily a ministry of succour, bodily and spiritual, especially to women, and should follow the lines of the primitive rather than of the modern diaconate of men" (Lambeth Conference, 1930 Report; reaffirming a resolution of 1920).

[2] Published for the Central Council for Women's Work, 1948. "Some part of the difficulty [in the recognition of deaconesses] undoubtedly arises from a tendency to assume that a deaconess is nothing more or less than a female deacon, or, in other words, the holder of an office preparatory to that of the priesthood" (p. 21). It may be wondered if the words "more or less" are ironic.

> "Her dedication is to service, not to authority. In the official and authorized acceptance of that dedication the Church has recognized her ministry; not as a part of the historic threefold ministry—this should be clearly understood—but a servant (Greek *Diakonos*) of the Church."

The distinction between service and authority suggests that they are mutually exclusive, an ironic conclusion surely not justified by the Prayer Book form and manner of making, ordaining and consecrating of bishops, priests, and deacons. Yet, the words of our Lord inevitably haunt the memory after reading a statement such as that quoted above.

> "Ye know that which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them; and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it is not so among you; but whosoever would become great among you, shall be your minister or servant. And whosoever would be first among you, shall be bondservant of all. For verily the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto (or, to be served) but to minister (or, to serve), and to give his life a ransom for many."[1]

An important hint of the fear of sex underlying the habit and ethos of the Church is the assumption of celibacy for the deaconess. A man, deacon, priest, or bishop, may marry a woman. A woman who is a deaconess may not marry a man and remain a deaconess. What is implied here? The emphasis and exact description of the office of deaconess was in terms of service, not of authority—presumably sacramental, "priestly" authority—so does this mean that even the *service*, the "succour bodily and spiritual", of a deaconess would be invalidated if she were married? Perhaps the reference to the primitive Church in the statement of the Lambeth Report is a reminder that in that period there were fears and suspicions more explicit than to-day of the flesh and the created-ness of natural and historic existence. At all events, we are moving here in a realm singularly unlighted by the grace and glory of the Gospel. The proximate background for the double standard in the relation of ordination to marriage (and it must be remembered that there is no parity even at the start, for the deaconess explicitly is not on a parity with the deacon) is, of course, the quasi-material or magical Augustinian concept of the character of ordination. Accordingly, the sacramental character of ordination would not "adhere" were the woman to contemplate the act of marriage.[2] But in this unilateral situation the same logic does not apply to the married priest. Even though the historical situations which might arise do not affect the logic herein implied, yet perhaps the temptation to reflect upon them may be forgiven. Thus, the woman whom the bishop, priest, or deacon, may marry, might be a Mrs Proudie or worse; and the man whom the deaconess might want to marry might be a doctor, teacher, or

[1] Mark 10. 42b–45.

[2] Cf. Note A, Indelibility, p. 125, *Doctrine in the Church of England*, 1938. "It is part of the traditional doctrine of Ordination to the Ministry that it, like Baptism and Confirmation, confers what in traditional language is called an 'indelible character'. This means . . . a man who has been ordained has once and for all received the commission, whether he exercise it or not."

even a priest, with whom she might work for the glory of God, yet this would not be possible.

The hinterland for this logic, or lack of it, is the simple fact of nature that the woman bears the child, and is the agent of the creative process. The married priest can be detached from his wife and child. Primitive society often emphasized the external character of the man to the family. So does the Christian Church. The married woman, while she is bearing and caring for the child, cannot be in the like fashion, external to the family. This is the very simple and obvious situation. But, as Christians, we are obliged to put this fact in the light of the Gospel, and to detect particular "judgments" either "after the flesh" or "according to law", whether derived from Levitical ordinances and the taboos of primitive society sanctified by history and religious practice, or from the ever recurring suspicion of the creative process which so often finds expression itself in dualistic interpretations of life and of flesh and history within Christianity itself.

The Gospel is the only context in which this question must be placed. Whenever the Church cannot bear the full glory of the Gospel of Redemption, she seeks to restrict its full operation, and, as with St Peter on the Mount of the Transfiguration, she would divide the economy of the Godhead, and build separate tabernacles. The words of St Augustine should be remembered:

> "He [St Peter] desired three tabernacles; the heavenly answer showed him we have One whom human judgment sought to divide. Christ the word, the word in the law, the word in the prophets. Why, Peter, seekest thou to divide them?"[1]

Anglicanism, traditionally emphasizing the doctrine of the Incarnation, should press the matter further. What is meant by the redemption of the flesh? The words of Gregory of Nazianzus are still valid, *τὸ ἀπρόσληπτον ἀθεράπευτον*. His further words especially appeal to women: "Let them not then begrudge us our complete salvation."[2] Perhaps the Johannine account of our Lord's words to Martha might serve as reminder that his glory could be beheld only by those willing to believe that flesh, even the stinking, decaying flesh of Lazarus, who had been dead four days, could be the vehicle of that glory? The words spoken to a woman have been witnessed by women who serve their Lord, whether as mothers or as nuns, as married or as single, by ministering to the flesh of his children. Is not this service in the flesh likewise part of the promise of glory? "Jesus saith unto her, Said I not unto thee, that, if thou believedst, thou shouldest see the glory of God?"[3]

URSULA M. NIEBUHR.

(Concluded)

---

[1] Sermon LXXVIII, quoted by A. M. Ramsey, p. 131, *The Glory of God and the Transfiguration*.

[2] Ep. ci. Cf. *Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, vii, p. 440.

[3] John 11. 40.

Great Preachers—IX. Spurgeon

No completely satisfactory explanation has yet been given of the hold which preaching had over nineteenth-century England. The sermon had been, of course, a great popular medium of theological and ecclesiastical controversy in the middle decades of the seventeenth century. Then for two or three generations it lost much of its power. The Evangelical Revival brought thousands of men and women again under the spell of field-preachers, of whom George Whitefield and John Wesley were the outstanding examples, and there followed a period when pulpit oratory flourished. Rowland Hill, Robert Hall, and Thomas Chalmers may be taken as the outstanding examples of the preaching of their generation. There are well-authenticated instances of men changing their place of work and residence that they might "sit under" Hall in Cambridge, Leicester or Bristol, and it is said that on more than one occasion he preached a congregation unconsciously to its feet. When Chalmers paid his first visit to London in 1817, Canning and Wilberforce climbed in through a window to hear him, Canning some time afterwards using the substance of the sermon in a speech in the Commons. A few years later Chalmers drew young Gladstone, then an undergraduate and an ardent Churchman and Tory, to a Baptist chapel to hear him.

By then the day of the great Victorian preachers had begun. William Jay was in the full tide of his success at Bath. John Angell James was preparing the way for R. W. Dale at Carr's Lane, Birmingham. C. M. Birrell and James Martineau were securing a hold on Liverpool. Alexander Maclaren was soon to begin his long reign at Union Chapel, Manchester. F. W. Robertson's ministry in Brighton lasted only six years, but his reputation became nation-wide. Thomas Binney drew great congregations to the Weigh House, London, and the year after Binney retired, Liddon was appointed a canon of St Paul's Cathedral, reigning there for twenty years. Almost every city and town in Victorian England had its favourite preacher, sometimes more than one. They belonged to different communions, though, since preaching was given a larger place in Nonconformist worship than in Anglican, the majority of the famous preachers were Nonconformists. The pulpit style of those who have been named differed widely. Success came to them because the age was ready and even eager to listen. It produced great preachers because it liked them and they spoke to its condition. That there were at work other motives besides the purely religious few will deny.

The best known of the Victorian preachers was Charles Haddon Spurgeon. His success was so phenomenal that he claims a place in any short list of the outstanding preachers of Christian history. His own generation thought of him as a new Whitefield, and Spurgeon himself, as late as 1879, spoke of Whitefield as his model. Comparisons have often been made between Spurgeon and Latimer. The hold he secured on London for over three decades has also been compared

with that of Chrysostom on Antioch and Savonarola on Florence. But Spurgeon was *sui generis*, and though there were no doubt some points of similarity with other illustrious preachers, his method and his achievement were peculiar to himself. His rise to fame was immediate, to some extent sensational. What was more remarkable, however, was the way he maintained his hold over a congregation unique in size, and how, even when he was dead (perhaps *felix opportunitate mortis* at the relatively early age of 57), his sermons continued to be printed and circulated in widening circles throughout the world for at least another twenty years.

Born in 1834, the son of a country Congregational minister, Spurgeon became usher in a Newmarket school at the age of fifteen. Probably his thoughts had always been drawn towards preaching, but in his middle teens he went through a period of spiritual distress in some ways comparable with that of Bunyan (though Spurgeon was younger and had seen far less of life than had the Bedfordshire tinker). Assurance of salvation came to him one snowy Sunday morning in 1850 in a Primitive Methodist chapel in Colchester. Four months later, he underwent believers' baptism in Isleham, led to the step by his study of the New Testament, and in August of the same year moved to a school in Cambridge. Lay-preaching in the villages around led to his undertaking regular service at Waterbeach a few months after his seventeenth birthday. The fame of this boy preacher soon spread throughout the fen country. In 1852 he made a rather halfhearted attempt to meet the Principal of a Baptist theological college, but there was a misunderstanding and Spurgeon himself interpreted it as a sign that ministerial training of the ordinary kind was not for him. He had already in Waterbeach tried his wings and seen his goal. "I often wish", he wrote to his grandfather in September 1853, "I were in China, India or Africa, so that I might preach, preach, preach all day long." Two months later he received an unexpected invitation to occupy the pulpit for a Sunday at a London Baptist church which was seeking a minister. His visit, in December, led to the request that he supply there for six months. The response he evoked was so swift and general that, in April 1854, any idea of a further probation period was swept aside and the young man of nineteen found himself established in London.

Large congregations quickly crowded to hear him. In part, of course, his youth contributed to the interest, but a discerning judge like Sheridan Knowles, the actor and playwright, recognized at once Spurgeon's gifts as a speaker: "He can do anything he pleases with his audience! He can make them laugh and cry and laugh again in five minutes. His power was never equalled." The secret lay partly in his voice, which was of remarkable range and quality. There was also his natural dramatic sense. A contemporary newspaper commented: "There never yet was a popular orator who did not talk more and better with his arms than with his tongue. . . . As soon as he begins to talk he begins to act; and that not as if declaiming on the stage, but as if conversing with you in the street." Spurgeon was, however, unprepossessing in appearance, short and stocky,

some have said ugly. But he made up for this by an unusual boldness and confidence in his mission. "The lad is impudent, very impudent", said Paxton Hood, but he also noted Spurgeon's strange power over ordinary people, and his burning sincerity.

Spurgeon's growing fame was aided by circumstances he was well able to exploit. While the New Park Street chapel was being enlarged, he preached in Exeter Hall, the crowds that wanted to hear him completely blocking the Strand. When it became obvious that a special building would have to be erected to hold his congregation, he found temporary quarters in the Surrey Gardens Music Hall. An unfortunate panic at an evening service led to seven people being killed, but from November 1856 to December 1859 he preached there on a Sunday morning, only ticket-holders being admitted. On the day of National Humiliation at the time of the Indian Mutiny a special service was held at the Crystal Palace at which Spurgeon preached to and, from all accounts, made himself heard by no less than 23,000 people. His own Tabernacle was completed in 1861. It had 3,600 seats, plus another 1,000 tip-up seats on the walls, but many more than this were frequently crowded into the building. The regular congregation showed little, if any, diminution from 1861 till Spurgeon's death thirty years later. Over 14,000 people were baptized and added to the membership, which in 1891 stood at 5,311. In the eighteen-sixties Spurgeon made preaching visits to Paris and to Holland, and also gave popular lectures under the auspices of the Y.M.C.A. There was also a special course of sermons in the Agricultural Hall, Islington, each attended by some 20,000 people. And Spurgeon was, of course, in constant demand for special anniversaries in London and the provinces. From his arrival in London in 1854 until his death in 1891 he preached, almost invariably, at least three new sermons a week. Most of his hearers belonged to the middle class, but he always had a hold over those who are usually described as artisans, and also influenced many men and women of great means and some of the highest in the land. Ruskin frequently attended the services in the Surrey Music Hall. Gladstone, on at least one occasion, went to the Metropolitan Tabernacle. It was even rumoured that the Queen had been there in disguise. There is indubitable evidence that both John Bright and Matthew Arnold attended Spurgeon's lectures on George Fox. There were, indeed, few of his outstanding contemporaries who did not at some time or other go, even if solely out of curiosity, to hear this remarkable preacher.

What was his message? Sir William Robertson Nicoll, who edited a selection of twenty-four representative sermons by Spurgeon, thought it possible to divide his preaching into three periods: that of extreme youth, that of his greatest powers and that, from 1876 onwards, when with a mellow wisdom there came also a growing gloom, because Spurgeon believed he saw around him a decay of faith. Some changes of mood there may have been, but there was little or no doctrinal development or alteration in his essential message. He preached constantly for decisions. "Flee from the wrath

to come, lay hold on eternal life." His appeal was always to Scripture, and he could draw on all parts of the Bible with an unrivalled knowledge. He knew intimately many of the old Puritan writers. Spurgeon is often and rightly described as a Calvinist, but it should be remembered that he was, in the theological sense, a moderate Calvinist, standing in the succession of Andrew Fuller, and often criticizing the hyper-Calvinism of an earlier day, and even Calvin himself, on the basis of the Bible. He held firmly to the doctrine of election as an impartial decree of God, but believed that redemption was open to all who had faith and that there must be a constant appeal to the unconverted. Men and women could, in his view, be saved only by personal faith in Christ, and much of what he said consisted of glowing passages in praise of his Lord. Spurgeon was not interested in theological systems, but in setting forth the truths he discovered in Scripture, even if they seemed at times contradictory. Asked once to reconcile the two parts of John 6. 37, he replied: "No, I never reconcile friends". His twin themes were sovereign grace and man's responsibility. "Do not conceive, my hearers, that some decree, passed in the dark ages of eternity, will save your souls, unless you believe in Christ." Belief in Christ meant for Spurgeon conformity to Christ. Faith and holiness were the assurance of one's election. With a wealth of resource, in plain language and with a growing knowledge of the human heart, he spoke to his fellows about sin and righteousness and judgment to come.

Spurgeon was not a theologian; he was not primarily an expositor of the Bible, like his contemporary Maclaren; he was an evangelist. His appeal was to the heart rather than to the intellect. But his sturdy commonsense and often pawky humour kept him from excessive emotionalism. He was not a revivalist in the American sense. It was his human qualities that endeared him to those who knew him best—the members of the Tabernacle, the students of the College he founded and whom he sent out to do valiant exploits in church extension, the children at his orphanage. Twice Spurgeon ventured into theological controversy and even those who sympathized with the positions for which he was contending, found it difficult to be happy about what occurred. A sermon against baptismal regeneration in 1864 led to a vigorous public debate and to Spurgeon's withdrawal from the Evangelical Alliance. A series of articles in *The Sword and Trowel* (the magazine of the Tabernacle) in 1887 on "The Down-Grade" led to his withdrawal from the Baptist Union. By the "Down-Grade" Spurgeon meant the growing tendency to doubt the plenary inspiration of the Bible, the vicarious nature of the Atonement and the doctrine of eternal punishment, all of which were for him fundamental. The controversy of 1887-8 was an involved and painful one, the full story of which has never been told. There were misunderstandings and mistakes on both sides. It was undoubtedly to Spurgeon's credit that neither then, nor at any time in his life, does he seem to have been seriously tempted to found a denomination of his own, though the personal and material resources at his command would have enabled him to do so.

Two glimpses of Spurgeon in his own pulpit in his later years are worth recalling. Neither are by Baptists. In 1885 Randall Davidson was Dean of Windsor and decided to visit the Tabernacle. He went, he says, with the approval of Archbishop Benson, but would not let his wife accompany him because, in view of W. T. Stead's revelations about the white slave traffic, it was thought that Spurgeon would preach "a coarse and trying sermon". "As it turned out", wrote Davidson, "he never directly alluded to it at all—but preached a most powerful sermon on final judgment—with a running reference throughout to all that has been published—but did not say one word which was indiscreet or coarse or harmful. I disagreed with nearly all he said about the Day of Judgment—but I could find no cause for censure with respect to his taste."

The other incident is recorded by the late Dr Carnegie Simpson, who visited the Tabernacle as a youth. He speaks of the great congregation, of the unprepossessing figure of the preacher, of his remarkable voice, and continues: "Spurgeon was preaching on the authority of Holy Scripture, and, as it was the time of what he called the 'downgrade' movement concerning inspiration, probably said a number of very orthodox things, all of which, however, I have quite forgotten. But I remember how, at one point, he took up some book and saying, 'Here is a work of current science—its day will pass', let the volume drop; 'here', he continued, taking up another book, 'is a fashionable novel—it will soon be dead', and it also he let fall; and then, taking the big pulpit Bible and holding it up in his arms, he cried, 'Here is the Word of God which endureth for ever'. Now the thing that strikes me in this incident is this. If I had attempted that gesture, it would not have been impressive—indeed, some of the hearers might have giggled. Why? Because my speaking was not of a size to admit so dramatic an illustration without incongruity. Spurgeon was speaking quite simply; he did not aim at any flights of eloquence. Yet the gesture was not too big for the speech."

Sermons by Latimer, Donne and F. W. Robertson are included in most series of popular classics. Spurgeon is not so represented. There are far more printed sermons of Spurgeon's to choose from than is the case of any of these others—some sixty-three volumes of them in all in *The New Park Street Pulpit* and *The Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit*, each containing between fifty and sixty sermons—and they have had a remarkable circulation as weekly tracts. He may be seen at his best in "Supposing Him to be the Gardener" and "There Go the Ships". But Spurgeon does not really read well, except in his *Lectures to My Students*. The transcript needs the preacher himself; but that is surely no condemnation. This was a great man, and it may be said with reverence that, like his Lord, he "spoke with authority and not as the scribes". In many parts of the world, his very name is still a power.

Ernest A. Payne.

American Letter: No. 10

Theology and Social Thinking in America

THE people of the United States are not escaping the general anxiety of the world these days, although commentators in other countries, noticing the apparent irresponsibility of so many proposals by leaders in our public life, may think we live in an unreal atmosphere. The fact of the matter is that the whole world to-day alternates between some form of unreality and a paralyzing despair, with the local situation in particular places giving a special colour to the local symptoms.

General MacArthur returned to the United States in the nearest parallel to the "triumphs" accorded the pro-consuls of ancient Rome that we have seen. Yet aside from a certain element in the upper middle class which is against anything the administration does regardless of what or why, the vitriolic attitude of a section of the press, and the desire of most Republican leaders to exploit the situation politically, there seemed to be a fairly general appreciation of the reasons for his removal from command. Newspaper reports of interviews with passers-by reported the incongruity of pro-MacArthur feeling and disagreement with his policies in the same individuals.

The attitude of the general public toward the Kaesong talks (which were still in process as this was written) was confusing. There was general desire for a cease-fire agreement, and also a feeling of frustration that not more had been accomplished in Korea, but this was counterbalanced by a fear of major war, coupled with unallayed distrust of Communist sincerity.

The news in our press of the Anglo-Iranian crisis caused a variety of reactions—the important thing being not so much the variety but rather that contradictory sentiments could be entertained by the same person simultaneously. The old feeling that America has to pull Britain's "chestnuts out of the fire" was still there. There was likewise a real fear that Iran might provide the occasion for a new and larger South Korea. Irritation and fear go hand in hand in a neurotic atmosphere.

During the late spring and summer the Congress, largely for political reasons, cut to pieces the price and wage control structure, opening the door for probable inflation with all its world consequences. It would be untrue to see this as only the most irresponsible political opportunism. The nineteenth-century economic theory that the automatic compensating mechanisms of a "free market" provide the best basis for general prosperity, still prevails in many quarters in this country. But in any event the world-wide implications of American economic policies were not taken into account very much.

We could look at other symptoms of American confusion, and they would tell much the same story. If anything reveals the bankruptcy of that kind of ethical culture religion which has marked American Christianity during the past three-quarter century, here it is. The churches have offered little leadership in this crisis of con-

fused thinking. To be sure, religious leaders have not been silent, but on the whole there are few indications that Christianity, as represented by the official leadership of the churches, has anything serious to say.

For the past ten years or so there has been a movement, entitled "Christian Mobilization", headed by the Rev. James Fifield, Jr, minister of a very large Congregational church in Los Angeles. By means of a magazine, sent free of charge to the clergy of the various leading churches, by statements in the press, and by regional meetings, this group has sought to provide a "Christian" substantiation for the most conservative and anti-administration groups in the United States. More recently, a weekly news magazine, "Christian Economics", with some of the same sponsors but with a number of fairly prominent Episcopalian names included, is propagandizing for the same ends: MacArthur versus Truman, bomb China, contain Communism, avoid foreign entanglements, reduce the number and extent of economic controls.

These groups do not really have much of a following. In one sense they are manifestations of a fear that the United States may more and more follow the pattern of British "socialism". But in another sense, they are symptoms of a theological confusion which cannot distinguish between necessary pragmatic judgments and basic faith. And in this sense they are in the same category as leftist groups within the churches which are committed to a Marxist solution of the world's ills.

On 4 July, the 175th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence was observed. Among the events connected with this observance was a "Freedom" program, sponsored by many of the "Christian Mobilization" and "Christian Economics" groups to which some of the better-known political liberals in the churches lent their names. The program called for sermons on the American heritage on the Sundays before and after the "Fourth", the reading of the Declaration of Independence on the day itself with the church bells being rung.

It is interesting to contemplate the difficulty most people had in applying this venerable document, a result of the mating of the British and French Enlightenments, to contemporary problems. Only by a *tour de force* can it be made to apply to the tension between Communist and western countries. Only by twisting its reasoning can it be made to call for a return of pre-World War I political economy. Certainly it speaks today to deep longing within the human heart, longings which are quite as legitimate in 1951 as in 1776, but it does not make an automatic connexion.

The anxiety, which is reflected by American confusion in a particularly American way, is world-wide. No theological understanding can eliminate the political and economic uncertainty of the day. The peculiarly ethical program nature of the American theological tradition, however, makes it especially inadequate as a basis for living in a world where contradictions are involved, not only in people's reactions, but in problems themselves.

There has been some growing awareness that this is so, but up to date the influence of a more incisive and profound Christianity has been small. One group worth watching is that known as Frontier Fellowship, made up of those associated chiefly with Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr of Union Theological Seminary, New York, and including such well-known writers and speakers as Prof. John C. Bennett and Prof. Paul Tillich, also of Union Seminary; Prof. Paul Lehmann, of Princeton Seminary; Prof. H. Richard Niebuhr, of Yale; and such Episcopalians as Prof. Albert Mollegen and Prof. Clifford Stanley of the Virginia Seminary. The overwhelming professorial character of its leadership is one of the practical weaknesses of this group.

Beginning in the middle '30's as the Fellowship of Socialist Christians, this group began with an attempt to make a mature synthesis between the insights of Marxism and the New Testament as understood in the light of continental theology. The relationship to Marxism was always critical, both as regards Marxist theory and to the various political programs claiming to be Marxist, but the name of the group led to a continual re-fighting of the battle for the right to criticize. Therefore, the name was changed. The signing of the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact brought a final cleavage between those who were of the mainstream of the fellowship and those who were primarily pro-Soviet.

Frontier Fellowship publishes a theological quarterly, *Christianity and Society*, originally *Radical Religion*. Dr Reinhold Niebuhr is the editor. The influence of this little quarterly is much wider than the group membership, but even this is small. The thinking overflows somewhat into the much more widely read bi-weekly, *Christianity and Crisis*, the board of which and consequently the general tone of which is much more eclectic.

Frontier Fellowship is cited here, not as the answer to the needs of America, but as an illustration of the fact that only a profound acceptance of the doctrine of "original sin" can enable the churches to provide any constructive leadership in our contemporary anxiety. At present that acceptance is neither wide nor profound. While the doctrine is not publicly rejected as it once was, it is still not really appreciated for what it has to say about the social confusion of our day. And because this insight is lacking, the churches are usually left with what is tantamount to a purely ethical program, even though it may be presented in educational or sacramental guise. If the first half of this century has taught American Christendom anything, it should be that a primarily ethical attack upon the world is not enough.

CHARLES D. KEAN.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Mascall is a Lecturer in Theology in the University of Oxford and a Student of Christ Church.

Mrs Niebuhr is Associate Professor and Chairman of the Department of Religion at Barnard College, Columbia University.

Dr Payne is General Secretary of the Baptist Union.

Dr Kean is Rector of Grace Episcopal Church, Kirkwood, Missouri.

CORRESPONDENCE

GRAVESTONES

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

An architect member of an unusually well-constituted Diocesan Advisory Committee revealed to me recently a manner of dealing with that intractable problem of white marble in churchyards, which perennially dismays people of sensibility. One ventures to hope that by acquainting your readers with it a steady quiet transformation of many a coruscating burial plot might ensue with widespread advantage.

The offending monuments should be liberally washed over with a ripe rich sludge of fresh cow-dung and water well stirred together. By the use of an old whitewash brush the simple task can proceed with expedition and in a few weeks of mild growing weather an admirable vesture of minute organic matter of a particularly pleasing shade of green transforms the marble without damaging it in any way. A natural process in fact is initiated which is normally slow to begin on a polished surface. Similar treatment will of course hasten an agreeable appearance of maturity with any other stonework. Thus what cannot be removed can be readily improved. Let us hope for a universal conspiracy of clergymen towards this desirable end.

In deference to the wishes of my informant permit me to sign myself

Your obedient servant,
JOHN VIRIDO.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE CLAIMS OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND. By G. D. Henderson. Hodder and Stoughton. 15s.

The aim of this book is "to describe briefly the main features of the history and constitution of the Church of Scotland . . . what that institution has actually stood for, what have been its guiding principles . . . and what today, in all modesty but with firm resolution and independence, it would claim as its position and outlook with respect to Scotland, to the Church of God in general, and to the realization of the Christian hope for the world". So Professor Henderson writes in his Preface; he is highly qualified for the task which he has set himself, and he has given us an eminently readable book. It is not a contribution to historical research, and it has curiously little to say on theological questions, but it is an attractive presentation of a widely shared point of view, and leads up to a really stimulating last chapter, on "Past and Future".

Anglicans will do well to read the book, because it is important that this point of view should be known. They will also do well to

keep their critical faculties alert as they read it; for there are some unjustifiable assumptions and some strange omissions. Thus on p. 5 there is the assumption that Scottish = Presbyterian; and the final establishment of Presbyterianism in 1690 is said to be due to the "general feeling of disillusionment" after thirty years of the restored Episcopacy, which left William and Mary no alternative. It should have been stated here that Episcopalians were in a majority at this time; that William turned to the Presbyterians for the simple reason that Episcopalians regarded themselves as bound by their oath of allegiance to James II; and that to enforce the new establishment the bishops and some six hundred of the clergy were expelled—a long process which required military assistance. Subsequent persecution, carried out ruthlessly by the Hanoverian Government, especially after the '15 and the '45, left only forty Episcopalian priests in the country. It is unfortunate that facts like these should pass unnoticed in an historical retrospect, and it is curious that Dr Henderson should be able to write, in a later chapter, that at the Revolution Settlement "an epoch of toleration commenced".

Is the issue between Presbyterianism and Episcopacy a theological one? It was certainly so regarded at the recent Anglo-Presbyterian conferences; and in 1580 "the whole Assembly of the Kirk", under Melville's influence, unanimously condemned the office of a bishop "as having neither fundament, ground, nor warrant in the Word of God", while it was "the common Scottish claim", up to a hundred years ago, "that Presbyterianism alone had Bible warrant as a form of Church Government". Dr Henderson records these findings, but rejects them; "Episcopacy", he says, "has unquestionable Bible warrant as a form of Church Government", and he adds—in apparent contradiction to the evidence which he has adduced—that "no Presbyterian ever denied this". It is essential to recognize that nationalist feeling plays a large part in this particular controversy.

Dr Henderson gives us an admirable account of the Presbyterian system at work; of separations and reunions within the Kirk; of the share taken by the laity in its affairs; of the nature of the Scottish Establishment; and of many other features in its history and in its present practice and outlook—e.g., public worship, the general loss of familiarity with the Bible, and the abiding, if diminished, influence of Calvin. The chapter on "Church and People" is especially good, though marred by one of the author's omissions—viz., in speaking of education he singles out the merchant class for honourable mention, as largely responsible for the founding of Edinburgh University and of Marischal College, Aberdeen; and two parish ministers who inspired these undertakings are named. But nothing is said of the Bishops who founded the Universities of St Andrews, Glasgow, and Aberdeen.

One more omission must be noticed, particularly unfortunate in a book of this kind; there is no index.

✠ERIC BRECHIN:

THE EARLY CORNISH EVANGELICALS, 1735-60: A Study of Walker of Truro and others. By G. C. B. Davies. S.P.C.K. 16s. 6d.

This valuable book sheds interesting light on the life of the Church in the eighteenth century. It should be read by all who seek an understanding of the origins of the Evangelicals and their contribution to the life of the Anglican Church. Too many are inclined to think of them as Methodists who remained in the Church. This book makes it clear that they were conscious of their rich heritage as churchmen, and in an age when churchmanship was at a low ebb they did everything in their power to make full use of the liturgy and sacraments.

A study of Walker of Truro has long been overdue for he exercised a profound influence on the Evangelical revival, and it was Charles Simeon who described his sermons as "the best in the English language". Anyone who writes on Walker must depend largely on the second edition of Sidney's *The Life and Ministry of the Rev. Samuel Walker* (1838) and Mr Davies has made extensive use of this work, now long out of print. This, however, does not detract from the value of the book which shows considerable signs of original research and contains much that is new and fresh.

Probably the most interesting part of the book for many will be the correspondence of Walker with John Wesley which reveals the striking difference that existed between the Methodists and the Evangelicals. Walker saw that the use of lay-preachers by Wesley would lead to schism, and he wrote a number of letters attempting to dissuade him from continuing this policy and warning him of the inevitable break that would come if he persisted in this practice. He also realized the weakness of Wesley's doctrine of assurance which had a tendency to depend on "sensible feelings". Walker repudiated this, for he knew that feelings might mislead, and he based his doctrine of assurance on the facts of our Lord's promises, his word and his life. The chapter on Walker's theology shows both the strength and weakness of Evangelical theology, the greatest omission being teaching about the nature and purpose of the Church. Moreover it is revealing that although the first chapter shows the appalling social conditons under which so many people lived Walker is apparently silent about the social implications of our Lord's message.

The main criticism of this book is that, excellent as it is, it could have been improved if the author had related the teaching of Walker to that of his contemporaries, especially of the Evangelical school. Thus Walker's use of catechizing might have been compared with that undertaken by the Welsh Evangelicals led by Griffith Jones, which was one of the secrets of the strength and influence of the Welsh Charity Schools. An attempt should have been made to link up Walker's doctrine of assurance with the views of other Evangelical leaders. A comparison of Walker's sacramental teaching with theirs would have been illuminating especially with that of his friend Adam from his *Practical Lectures in the Church Catechism*, which is surprisingly omitted in the Bibliography. Then, too, there in some interesting teaching in the work of Walker's contemporary

Jones of St Saviour, Southwark, in his *Exposition of the Church Catechism in eight discourses.* The same criticism applies to the chapter on "The Clerical Club", the first of its kind in the country. The essence of the movement was to find expression in societies, and the Clerical Club at Truro had its counterparts in other places, Hotham, Elland, Bristol, Creaton, the "Eclectic Society" meeting in Cecil's vestry at St John's, Bedford Row, etc. Such a digression would have added immensely to the value of the book. What a pity, too, that Walker's rules for his local society were not printed in an appendix! They were adopted by James Hervey of Weston-Favel and were even included in *The Whole Works of the late Reverend James Hervey,* published in 1815 (Vol. 5, p. 233).

In the account of Haweis it was surprising to find the omission of his *The communicant's spiritual companion; or an evangelical preparation for the Lord's Supper,* originally published in 1763 which had reached its sixth edition by 1770, and was subsequently published by printers in Cork, Dublin, Shrewsbury, and Edinburgh. Apart from Bishop Wilson's *On the Lord's Supper* this was the most popular communicant's manual of the period. The Evangelicals, too, were really the first to introduce hymn singing into the worship of the parish churches, and Haweis had a much greater influence on this development than the writer seems aware of. We know that Simeon was much impressed by the worship of Haweis's congregation at Aldwinckle and that as a result of his visit he introduced a new organ at Holy Trinity Church, Cambridge, in 1794.

We are grateful to Mr Davies for this book which will take its place among the standard works on the movement.

GWYN ROGERS.

WIGAN.

THE NORMAN ANONYMOUS OF 1100 A.D. By George H. Williams. "Harvard Theological Studies, XVIII." Harvard University Press. London: Cumberlege. $2.50.

A student armed with the *Libelli de Lite* volume of the "Monumenta Germaniae Historica," the so-called "Benedictional" of Archbishop Robert and the Three Coronation Orders, published by the Henry Bradshaw Society, the third volume of A. J. Carlyle's *History of Medieval Political Theory* and Mr Leopold Wickham Legg's translation of Dr Schramm's work on English Coronations can promise himself a pleasant, if arduous, week's holiday in the perusal of the latest addition to the invaluable series of Harvard Theological Studies. As he notes the various learning compacted in the footnotes, numbered consecutively 1-780 and mercifully placed at the foot of the pages, he may envy perhaps the happy lot of the American research student with "everything handsome about him", even if desiderating a bibliography and an index. But his attention will chiefly be fixed upon three features which give to the work more permanent importance. The first of these is indicated by the subtitle "Toward the Identification and Evaluation of the so-called

Anonymous of York". Here is indeed a battleground or rather a whole series of stricken fields, of which the ghastly débris provides material for annotation, and he will be unusually cold-blooded if he does not find himself becoming at times a partisan, as he reads for example that "the 'scientia . . . crebrius colitur', would be a much more appropriate claim for the province containing Bec and Caen than for the province of York". The student become critic is bound to be a disciple of Mrs Battle, and will disdain such mean advantages as "Why cannot the man write English?" especially if, having recourse to an American dictionary, he discovers that a neologism to which he objects has the respectable authority of Joseph Addison (presumably in a moment of aberration). It is clear that the author is a bad proof-reader and that his zeal to establish a case suggests lack of discrimination. But when all is said and done the reviewer, with a conscious desire for a different verdict, is disposed to hold that Dr Williams shows good cause not with Böhmer "to hypothesize an anonymous Rouen cleric" but Archbishop "William Bona Anima" as author. But if so, the second feature, "*Regnum* and *Sacedotium* in the Thought of the Anonymous of Rouen" (pp. 127-99)—a remarkable piece of argumentation even in the vast literature of the *Investiturstreit*—becomes even more astonishing. Anti-papalism has seldom gone further than in this glittering theorem suspended like a "skylon" between heaven and earth. Even the ingenuity of Dr Williams is hard put to reconcile its Christology with orthodoxy, nor do illustrations from Luther, Henry VIII, Cranmer, etc., help him. The third feature is a real boon to students, since the Appendix (pp. 205-36), by including the hitherto unedited sections of the famous Parker MS. C.C.C.C. 415, makes the whole text of the writings ascribed to the Anonymous at last available. As a whole the book is one of which all engaged in the subject must make their account, while bearing in mind the gap between "might, could, would, should" and "did".

Claude Jenkins.

Christ Church, Oxford.

The Cultural Revolution of the Seventeenth Century. By S. L. Bethell. Dennis Dobson. 15s.

Mr Bethell's new book takes its start from T. S. Eliot's famous essay on The Metaphysical Poets, in which he speaks of the "dissociation of sensibility" which set in during the seventeenth century. The passage is very familiar, but it may be quoted once again:

> "A thought to Donne was an experience; it modified his sensibility. When a poet's mind is perfectly equipped for its work, it is constantly amalgamating disparate experience; the ordinary man's experience is chaotic, irregular, fragmentary. The latter falls in love, or reads Spinoza, and these two experiences have nothing to do with each other, or with the noise of the typewriter or the

smell of cooking; in the mind of the poet these experiences are always forming new wholes."

Now there is a certain unwarranted generalization about those lines, for Mr Eliot was really concerned less with Donne than with the sort of poetry he himself wanted to write. Nevertheless, he points to an important truth. Donne and his contemporaries still inherited the "world-picture" of the Middle Ages—the Great Chain of Being, the hierarchical structure of the universe, the corresponding planes, the interaction and analogy between all levels of life and existence. Physical science had already demolished much of it—but this made it still more precious, and in some ways more exciting to the imagination. One no longer needed to worry about some of the obvious practical inconveniences of the system. But, even in decay, it afforded what Professor Basil Willey calls: ". . . the capacity to live in divided and distinguished worlds".

Mr Bethell's main contribution to the study of the disintegration of this "world-picture" is to relate it not only to the literature but also to the theology of the period. The Age of Reason, he argues, was really the Age of the Restriction of Reason. "Reason to the Elizabethans may thus be said to have included faith, intuition, feeling, as well as the more strictly rational processes. Beauty, goodness, love, were a part of truth. For the post-Restoration scientific universe, on the other hand, mathematics was the model." All this leads inevitably to specialization, to the sealing off of one form of experience from another, and to the "dissociation" of a great deal more than sensibility.

Perhaps Mr Bethell's argument is made to adjust itself too easily to his preferences and prejudices—his dislike of the Evangelicals, for instance, and his lack of enthusiasm for Traherne. But the book deals with immensely important issues and Mr Bethell wisely points out that the one-way materialism of our time may ". . . prove negatively convincing and serve to clear the way for a deeper understanding of the human mind and the universe which it has to cope with". Atomic physics is rapidly evolving a "world-picture" as fantastic, as remote from the experience of hand and eye, as is the most primitive medieval cosmology. But the way towards reintegration lies not in the rejection of science but in an attempt to absorb it once more into the sphere of true understanding, to make it a part of the whole.

The book, which concludes with an essay on the poetry of Henry Vaughan, reveals the wide and often astonishing range of reference which we expect from this author, though with rather less than usual of his characteristic wit.

Norman Nicholson.
Millom, Cumberland.

Johann Georg Hamann: An Existentialist. By Walter Lowrie. Princeton Theological Seminary. 75c.

Now that philosophy in England seems to consist largely of converting the categorical into the hypothetical and the simple, straight-

forward commonplace into circumlocutory gibberish, it is particularly imperative to have attention drawn to Hamann, who lived from 1730 to 1788, the fellow-citizen, friend, and critic of Kant. For Hamann is the outstanding philosopher of "The Word", by the side of whom such triflers in symbolism as Bentham dwindle to vanishing point. It is true that in countries where men can busy themselves with language and remain oblivious to the implications of the treasures of national poetry, not even the profound but baffling affirmations of Hamann regarding ciphers and secret signs can be expected to convince all and sundry that, notwithstanding an eternal predominance of human parrots, speech is inspired. Hamann is for the elect. Perhaps that is why nothing of his has been translated in England and America, and why, if he is mentioned there at all, he is apt to be dismissed as an incoherent precursor of romanticism. In order to correct that obtuseness, it is well to see how Kierkegaard refers to him. That Kierkegaard was deeply in his debt may be gauged by matching what both men say of Socrates. The indebtedness was personal, yet in part typical. The service which Hamann rendered to Kierkegaard in saving him from the Hegelianism prevalent around him is of a kind which Hamann can still render to-day.

It is through Kierkegaard that Dr Lowrie—the biographer of Kierkegaard and one of his chief translators—came to Hamann. His booklet is in two parts. The first is an admirable summary of Hamann's chequered life. The second consists of notes on writings regarded as characteristic. Hamann was a Christian by conversion, and, simultaneously with being converted, he was turned, in the heyday of rationalism, into an anti-rationalist. Indeed, to consider him is to be led to realize that Kant, for all his epoch-making originality, was thoroughly at home in the world of his day, a docile child of the enlightenment. Hamann, on the contrary, was a rebel. But Hamann did not disdain reason like a romantic, owing to shallow faith in some hedonism of the passing impulse. He was an anti-rationalist in the manner of Pascal, because of the conviction that a contrite and tranquil heart is a more robust asset than an inquisitive and restless head, and he had both. As he himself put it, "The noble *sum* must not be made subordinate to the *cogito*." The saying is enough to warrant Dr Lowrie in calling him "an existentialist", and yet it might be, if less fashionable, more true to say that he perceived with Augustine and the great Schoolmen how the real *summum bonum* is perfect being. Secure in that perception, he could fortify his faith with scepticism.

However, when Dr Lowrie has dwelt on that sort of thing, he has certainly provided an introduction to Hamann, but he has not sufficiently emphasized the pre-eminence for Hamann of a doctrine of language as revelation. If Hamann could write, "*Incredibile sed verum*: lies and fictitious romances must be plausible, and so too hypotheses and fables; but not the truths and fundamental affirmations of our faith", it was because the certitude which he drew from Scripture was confirmed on every side by both history and "the lore of nature". In a contribution some years ago to the *Hibbert*

Journal—the only account, I am told, of Hamann's thought to have appeared in England—Mr Ronald Gregor Smith wrote:

> Revelation, which is the speech of God, is for Hamann a vast and all-inclusive action, from which no part of life is *a priori* to be excluded. The Word, though found in Scripture, first made known in Scripture, and always regulated by Scripture, is also found in nature and history, and the soul of man.

The statement makes it of interest that, in a letter posterior to the publication of the booklet, Dr Lowrie informs me that Professor James O'Flaherty has submitted to the University of Chicago a long "doctoral dissertation" which treats theories of language as the heart of Hamann's teaching.

PETERBOROUGH. MONTGOMERY BELGION.

FRANCIS HERBERT BRADLEY. By W. F. Lofthouse. Epworth Press. 10s. 6d.

While not placing F. H. Bradley among "the heights and pinnacles of the human mind", Dr Lofthouse estimates him, as indeed he was, as a philosopher of "true eminence", and it is as a disciple, albeit a critical and discerning one, that he writes of him. He gives a short account of Bradley's background, of his outwardly uneventful life at Oxford, and of some of his critics. There is an estimate of his earlier work, particularly of his *Presuppositions of Critical History* (1874), which contained not a little about the nature of history then less widely accepted than it has since become; and then, in the main, the book is an exposition, with interwoven comments, of the *Ethical Studies*, the *Principles of Logic*, and *Appearance and Reality*.

Dr Lofthouse is well aware of the contemporary anti-metaphysical bias which has put Bradley out of fashion, and the charges of meaninglessness made against many of the problems which he handled so thoroughly, so he cannot have hoped that this book would be popular. His purpose is to set forth Bradley's views about the nature and meaning of being, with more than usual attention to the effect of his conclusions on religion. He attempts to show that these are less difficult to harmonize with the requirements of religion than has often been supposed. If "the Absolute" means the totality of the existent, then certainly there is an Absolute. But, before examination, it may be a One or a Many, or a One and a Many, and the last is alone fully consistent with ethical theism. Dr Lofthouse is therefore justified in emphasizing Bradley's refusal to identify God with the Absolute. But no developments of Bradley's position which enable the conclusion that "we can think of God as being everything and in everything" can escape more than a suspicion of pantheistic acosmism.

Bradley's Absolute was the totality of all experience, unified yet "somehow" containing in itself God and all the experience of the "finite centres", which are alike differentiated "appearances". To rehabilitate this form of Absolutism, whether it be called idealist or

realist, will require a refutation of the grounds, which are wider than those of Russell's logic and logical positivism, on which it has been so generally rejected. The determining basis of Bradley's philosophy was not only a conviction that the reality of things reveals itself in their "togetherness", but a predilection for a particular kind of systematic unity. So based, it becomes too much like very ingenious free composition rather than anything that can be called knowledge or fact-based probable belief. There is nothing but prejudice for supposing existence to be intelligible if it be one and unintelligible if it be eleven or twenty-three. Bradley thought the idea of several reals, each distinct, to be contradictory: they might exist but would still have the one quality of reality. True; but the quality is no more real or ultimate than the several reals and is nothing but an abstraction without them. Again, "For metaphysics there is no difference between experienced and experiencer: it is only in psychology that the distinction is justified." But what, other than psychology, can afford any basis for any such dictum about experience?

But if Dr Lofthouse's book leads students to read Bradley it will be well worth while. Apart from his conclusions about the nature of being and reality, by his extraordinarily acute handling of many perplexing problems, and his fine style, though he may leave us unsatisfied, he leaves us, as Dr Lofthouse says, like sober men among dreamers.

J. S. Bezzant.
Liverpool.

The York Cycle of Mystery Plays. A Shorter Version of the Ancient Cycle. Edited by J. S. Purvis. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

Gerald of Wales. A Play by K. M. Baxter. S.P.C.K. for the Religious Drama Society. 3s.

Our Lady's Tumbler. By Ronald Duncan. Faber. 8s. 6d.

Dr Purvis's version of some 5,000 of the 13,000 lines of the York Mystery Plays, edited by Toulmin Smith in 1885, was the text used when these plays were revived in York this summer after a lapse of 370 years. The immense success of the revival owed much to the dramatic vigour and interest of the medieval plays and a very great deal indeed to Martin Browne's brilliant production, but a comparison of Dr Purvis's version with the original shows that he is the real architect of what has proved to be a dramatic event of extraordinary interest and value. His translation of fourteenth-century rhyming verse into modern rhyming verse, involving very often quite considerable alteration in rhyme pattern, distorts the original surprisingly little: many of the best lines come across unaltered and, where alteration occurs, it rarely weakens either the sense or the sound. Dr Purvis has soaked his imagination in the speech of the medieval dramatists and can speak our language with their voice. More important still he has carved out the best material from the rather cumbersome original and knit it into a firm and well-balanced

piece of stage craft that moves with agility from the Creation and Fall to the Annunciation, thence to the Passion, Harrowing of Hell, and Resurrection, and thence to the Last Judgment. He gives into the producer's hands not a series of excerpts from a whole lot of plays, but a single play, a play that necessarily avoids the colossal extravagance of the Middle Ages (there must have been a full score of men playing the part of Christ alone) and yet presents in a valid and recognizable form that great Christian myth which the ages of faith carved on their cathedral portals, painted on their church walls, blazened forth in their stained glass, and embodied in their Liturgy, the imaginative apprehension which inspired the making of Christendom.

Whether parish players can make profitable use of this treasure remains to be seen. The performance at York formed part of the city's contribution to the Festival of Britain, the immediate motive being antiquarian. Much has happened since Archbishop Grindal sent for the book of the York Plays and failed to return it. The Bible, if we hear it at all, tells us a different story, or rather the same story with a different meaning. These plays present the myth through a coloured medium and it would not be well, if indeed it were possible, for this kind of revival to supplant the expression in dramatic terms of our own contemporary religious apprehension. At the same time the directness and simplicity of these plays and their concentration upon the overall pattern of the Christian story give us a hint of what we should be trying to do.

That we are trying to do something appears in the other two modern plays under consideration, both of which were commissioned for performance in cathedrals during the Festival of Britain. They are only two of a larger number of plays which owe their origin to this same demand for a contemporary religious drama. Mrs Baxter's play is a chronicle about a chronicler, Giraldus Cambrensis; it is written in blank verse which occasionally strikes a Browning-esque note, and includes ten scenes in which Gerald grows from extreme youth to advanced age, one-quarter a Welshman in blood but increasingly Welsh in spirit, his heart set upon a bishopric or an archbishopric which in the end he fails to secure. It is a useful piece of *ad hoc* writing and while its language lacks the imaginative tension which one expects should accompany the use of a verse rhythm, the play must have seemed very suitable performed at St David's upon such an occasion.

Mr Duncan, whose play was commissioned for Salisbury Cathedral, has higher literary ambitions in his charming version of the well-known legend of Our Lady's Tumbler, though it must be said that his elaborately patterned verses are less successful than his more straightforward dialogue. The monks make their offering to the Madonna on her birthday: they present a rose, which is chosen with pretty speeches; a song, which is sung by choirboys; a poem, which is first rehearsed and then recited in full during the ceremony. The scene in which Brother Andrew alone in the chapel doffs his monk's habit and appears as Merry Andrew grown old and with a weak

heart, fails to do his tricks and dies at the foot of the Madonna, who drops the rose upon his body, is as touching as one could wish.

It is much that there should be authorities to commission and playwrights to create plays of this quality for special occasions: clearly the movement towards a modern religious drama gathers weight and momentum. It is well, nevertheless, that we have the work of the medieval masters alive in our midst to keep us in a proper state of humility and to remind us of the heights.

Phillip J. Lamb.

St John's College,
York.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Greatness of God and the Dignity of Man. By Percy Leonard. Skeffington. 8s. 6d.

In an age of hurry and apparent lack of time, one value of an anthology is that it does so much work for its reader. It is true that we must trust to another to discern and collect the pearls of wisdom and beauty, and obviously an anthology can never mean to a reader what it does to a compiler. It seems to me, however, that Mr Leonard has collected together a large number of pearls and has, on the whole, arranged them helpfully.

In form this anthology is conventional; it follows the pattern of many devotional books, and its reader is offered a series of daily meditations—or suggestions for meditation, since all quotations are short—centred upon a Biblical text and revolving round the two themes of the title. It is a measure of Mr Leonard's success that as I read, pencil in hand. to make notes for a review, I found myself underlining passages for myself which struck me simply because of their spiritual insight and truth.

The two themes, although given a section each, are part of one another. "The Greatness of God" includes all aspects of God to be found in the Old and New Testaments. In this section there are as many texts from the Old Testament as from the New, but in the second section, on the Dignity of Man, there is only one. Is there any truth in the idea which this suggests, that the Old Testament predominantly reveals the nature of God, while the New Testament reveals the true nature of man? Be that as it may, in this anthology man has no dignity apart from God, and his greatness lies in the fact that he has been redeemed by the Son of God.

The anthology must be read as is intended, slowly and day by day. When read straight through, as a reviewer must, it tends to be too repetitive: the effect of too many words about God is to drive from us that stillness of spirit in which alone man can worship him. But when used as Mr Leonard asks us to use it, it can give both joy and inspiration.

Diana Collins.

London.

Pascal's Short Life of Christ. Translated with an Introduction by Emile Caillet and John C. Blankenagel. Princeton Pamphlets. 75 cents.

This translation is long overdue. Hitherto its literary merit has been somewhat overshadowed by the brilliance of Pascal's *Mystère de Jésus*, but the presentation of this neglected work to the English-reading world is certainly justified.

Pascal's chronology and topography may seem crudely precise at times, but one cannot help admiring his attempts to combine differences between the gospels, e.g., between Matthew and Mark in §87, "into the region of Magadan and Dalmanutha", and in §150 "two blind men, one of whom was named Bartimeus", and between Matthew and Luke in §95 "six days thereafter inclusive, or eight days thereafter exclusive"(?). His theology is so careful; he brings into relief the complete voluntariness of the death of our Lord, and distinguishes Christ's sonship to God by nature from that of the rest of mankind by adoption. His stark realism and almost scientific fidelity to recorded fact stand in contrast to the liberal, romantic approach of his compatriot Renan.

Although Scripture is its own interpreter for Pascal, he faithfully follows the signposts of Church tradition from Josephus, Tertullian, and Ambrose, to Augustine. The translators' preface reveals his indebtedness to more recent sources also.

Here is a contribution that will not only be warmly welcomed by lovers of Pascal, but should also be of interest to Christologist, New Testament expositor, and literary critic. Furthermore, by this attempt at harmonizing and summarizing the gospels into a consecutive biography, interspersed with comment, Pascal may realize for our hurried world the Port Royalist aim of bringing the Bible within reach of the common man.

J. C. Mears.

Parachute Padre. By J. Fraser McLuskey. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

The assignment of the Special Air Service Brigade in 1944 was to be dropped in "small parties" from the air in central France, to live behind the German lines, to co-operate with the Maquis, and to harry the enemy with surprise attacks. The operation was to be a detail in the large-scale invasion of Europe, but it developed along its own lines and in its peculiar environment as local guerilla warfare. French and Belgian regiments were included, each with its own chaplain. The two British regiments were allotted British chaplains, the 1st S.A.S. Regiment being accompanied by a Church of Scotland padre, the Rev. J. F. McLuskey.

The record of this exploit will come as news to many who now pick up Fraser McLuskey's logbook. He tells his tale with modesty, honesty, and humour, and only that amount of suppression of information which security imposes. It is a strangely moving document. Here is concentrated the essence of the spirit of the entire

B.L.A., with its comradeship and hazards, its gaiety and reality. To readers who shared, even if only on firm ground, something of the events which fringe this tale the high level of life in campaigning days is humiliatingly recalled: "Oh to be a liberator again!" (p. 114). Here also is a challenge to younger men, including younger clergy.

When Fraser admits his determination not to be left behind after his regiment had completed their training, but to be parachuted with them, and therefore to find a job (which turned out to be that of jeep driver) to justify his share in the danger, he is characteristically understating facts. His chapter on "Parish Duties" in France shows how he used his opportunities pastorally. Worship became vitally real for two reasons. Fear was present to humble men and bring them to God; a community of men who worked and risked their lives together began naturally to worship together. And in the simple camp services, "even at the Communion Table", "ecumenicity" without being named was experienced. Discerning minds may discover in these allusions hints of a technique which, in the more normal setting of a post-war parish, may reknit parson and people.

W. W. S. March.

Goring-by-Sea.

The Lord's Prayer. By Hugh Martin. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

Thoughts for Meditation. By N. Gangulee. With a foreword by T. S. Eliot. Faber. 9s. 6d.

More Professional Prayers. By A. Gille. With a foreword by Lady Margaret Sackville. R. H. Johns, Newport, Mon. 4s. 6d.

"The Bible depicts God's ways with man in the 'large letters' of the history of a community. If we can spell them out, we shall read also his ways with us individually. It is a matter of 'living ourselves into' the Biblical history" (C. H. Dodd, *The Bible to-day*, p. 157). Therefore the Bible should form the groundwork of our personal, as well as our corporate, prayer.

For this reason Dr Hugh Martin's book, *The Lord's Prayer*, should receive a great welcome, particularly from those whose time for Bible-reading and prayer must necessarily often be short. He gives a useful introduction, from three to ten pages in length, to each of the eight clauses of this prayer; and time might be set apart for studying these on Sundays. Then for each day of the week he skilfully links to these clauses chosen passages of Scripture with a brief comment and prayer.

There is one line of interpretation of the Lord's prayer to which Dr Martin gives little attention. Sir Edwyn Hoskyns expressed it forcibly when he called this prayer an "eschatological utterance": "the prayer which our Lord gave his disciples is, with the exception of one petition, simply an earnest request to God that the Kingdom may not be delayed, and that his disciples may be ready when the Kingdom appears": and even this one clause with its obscure Greek, "Give us to-day our bread for to-morrow (*τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον,*)

may perhaps turn out after all to be no exception and to refer to the manna of the eschatological sabbath, "an earnest of the imminent advent of the rule of God" (*Cambridge Sermons*, pp. 18–20).

Thoughts for Meditation is an anthology that Mr Gangulee has collected in the course of many years of spiritual reading. He places rather indiscriminately beside Isaiah, St Matthew, and St John quotations from Christian mystics and Moslem, Hindu, and Buddhist devotional writers. It is a strange use of the Scriptures to take them so violently out of their place in the account of God's mighty acts, by which he has redeemed his people and is gathering them together into one "in Christ". Mr T. S. Eliot in his preface to this book also wisely reminds the readers "that no man has ever climbed to the higher stages of the spiritual life, who has not been a believer in a particular religion or at least a particular philosophy", and that the passages here selected can only reveal their meaning to one "who has his own religion of dogma and doctrine in which he believes" (pp. 13, 14).

Dr Gille in *More Professional Prayers* composes prayers of people in fifty different occupations. They are not so much prayers to be prayed, as oblique but lively sketches of the people who are supposed to be praying.

S. M. Gibbard, S.S.J.E.

Oxford.

The Concept of Māyā. By P. D. Devanandan. Lutterworth Press. 21s.

This is a valuable work. It is scholarly, profound and alive. Its interest is not confined to students of Hinduism, for in his concluding analysis of the ferment of thought in India to-day, Dr Devanandan, who is Professor of the Philosophy of Religion at the United Theological College, Bangalore, indicates further ground for emphasizing the relation between belief in a personal God and an effective belief in human dignity. "At no time has there been new recognition of the worth of the individual except on the basis of a new discovery of the meaning of God."

Is India on the threshold of such discovery? That is the question Dr Devanandan poses. If so it will mean a re-examination of such basic doctrines as the doctrine of Māyā, the conviction that life is evanescent, that the world is delusion, a conviction largely responsible for what has been described as the characteristic indifference of the Hindu to the adventure of life. For theory must march with practice and that characteristic indifference is shaken by the fact that "in modern India a sudden desire for self-expression has completely overwhelmed over sixty millions of the Hindu community." Consequently "a new Hindu ideology is in the making. . . . Will terms like karma, māyā, and the like survive in the new religious atmosphere?" Or will new bottles be needed to contain the new wine of thought?

In his sympathetic analysis of the situation, which takes into account not only the intellectuals and gives illuminating reference to such radical interpreters as Sir S. Radhakrishnan but also includes the outlook of the unlettered peasant, Dr Devanandan provides valuable material for all concerned with the presentation of the Christian gospel in India to-day.

At the same time, by his scholarly study of the basic doctrine of Māyā, which is the main content of this work, he places all students of Comparative Religion in his debt. They will observe with particular interest his suggestion that a pre-Vedic concept of Māyā has significant affinities with the concept of a diffused, impersonal vital force designated elsewhere as Mana.

R. H. L. Slater.

McGill University,
Montreal.

Magnificent Heritage. Studies in the History of the Church of England. H. G. G. Herklots. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

All serious study groups should know about this book since it has been prepared for their benefit and no close rival exists. The questions for discussion after each chapter are well chosen and worded. The author shows himself as a good popular *outlineer,* equally avoiding cheap entertainment and the too expensively academic. He has a gift for making us constantly aware of the whole living length of his history.

> "The Church of the Middle Ages did not talk about 'visual aids'. But it understood very well how to use them."

> "Almost all the grumbles which nowadays we direct against the bureaucracy must then perforce have been directed against the Church."

These judgments illustrate the capacity to link ages and to link also the falsely fragmented subjects of so-called secular and sacred history. The general plan of contents shows a foreshortening which is open to criticism. After two opening chapters on primitive and medieval backgrounds and one each on sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the remaining five are concerned mainly with the last 120 years. I would however more seriously question exclusive use of chronological method in neglect of continuous topics. In the medieval section, especially, I felt the unsatisfactory conflation of three important subjects—thought, ecclesiastical organization, and parish life. The history of thought would greatly gain by more continuous treatment; only so could we discern some pattern in the adventures of orthodoxy among successive climates of human opinion. But this is criticism of established method rather than of Canon Herklotts. My final word is one of praise, for the tackling of an important subject on an unusual scale, with a vigorous newness of voice.

E. W. Edmonds.

Barming.

JOHN BUNYAN, THE MAN AND HIS WORKS. By Henri Talon. Rockliff. 25s.

Professor Henri Talon is a considerable critic of English literature with three recent books to his credit. In this one, which appeared as a French thesis in 1948 and is now back in translation, entirely free from the English habit of Nonconformist partisanship, he examines an abundance of literary work with great care. He discovers how *Pilgrim's Progress* came to be written and studies it in such a way as to draw out its full religious and literary significance. He insists on the normality of so many of the Puritans, exposing them for admiration instead of ridicule, choosing Bunyan as a prototype and drawing upon a knowledge of writers as far apart as St Paul, Wesley, Kierkegaard, and Charles Péguy.

Where Prof. Talon excels is in the study of religious autobiography and in the progressive unfolding of soul which we experience in the major works of John Bunyan. He makes and substantiates high claims for the novel *Mr Badman*, but finding *The Holy War* an allegory contrived and not created, gently rejects it. The final section of the book is devoted to social, religious, moral, and political problems in Bunyan's period, and it is unfortunate that he is not quite abreast of current English writing on religious and political inter-relations in the ideas of the Levellers and other Radicals.

The study of the culture of the poorer classes in seventeenth-century England is a fascinating one which is not accorded sufficient treatment. We should like to know more of the probable reaction of the English people, amidst the deluge of religious instruction, to such a publication as Bunyan's Chart of Salvation and Damnation, which Prof. Talon nowhere mentions. This is a curious sheet, a link which binds the medieval thinker to the Calvinist, and which shows up their differences immediately. It will prove as well anything else the literary genius of the quondam tinker who could develop Christian and Badman out of a chart of lines and circles and deep self-scrutiny.

MAURICE HUSSEY.

CAMBRIDGE.

GOD SO LOVED THE WORLD. By Elizabeth Goudge. Hodder and Stoughton. 10s. 6d.

Opinions about the purpose and value of ornamental stained-glass windows will always vary. Some people admire them and find them an aid to devotion, others prefer their church-windows plain. Miss Goudge's life of Christ may be classed as a literary stained-glass window. She has a deep reverence for her subject, and desires to make the Incarnation real to her readers. She keeps, on the whole, close to the Gospel records, choosing sometimes the Synoptic and sometimes the Johannine accounts, but seems to take no account of any modern work on the Gospels. Her diatessaron has no pretensions to scholarship, and no references are given. Miss Goudge writes easily and fluently, as befits an accomplished novelist, and has made

her material into a harmonious whole; but the preface does not state for what class of readers the book is intended. It is however probable that it will appeal to those with a taste for ornamental stained-glass, a taste which has always been legitimate, but is not universal.

P. R. P. BARKER.

WOOLAVINGTON.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CHRISTIAN PAMPHLETS (6, FITZROY SQUARE, W.1): *Christian Pamphlets: a select bibliography*, List No. 4, 1951 (6d.).

A. AND C. BLACK: Gottfried Quell, etc., *Righteousness* (7s. 6d.); *Sin* (7s. 6d.). [Two additions to the series "Bible Key Words from Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch."]

BURNS OATES: A. Bonnar, *The Catholic Doctor* (12s. 6d.). [5th edition; see review in THEOLOGY, September, 1944, p. 216.]

CHURCH UNION: *The Church of England and the Free Churches*, A Report of the Theological and Liturgical Committee of the Church Union (1s. 3d.).

DACRE PRESS: J. C. Bourner, *The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in Early Methodism* (25s.).

DESCLÉE DE BROUWER: Richard de Saint-Victor, *Sermons et Opuscules Spirituels Inédits: Tome I-L'édit D'Alexandre ou les Trois Processions.* (n.p.).

EPWORTH PRESS: J. R. Nelson, *The Realm of Redemption* (15s.).

FABER AND FABER: Gerald Heard, *Is God in History?* (15s.).

GOLLANCZ: Karl Jaspers, *Way to Wisdom: an introduction to philosophy* (10s. 6d.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: L. D. Weatherhead, *Psychology, Religion and Healing* (25s.).

HUTCHINSON: S. G. F. Brandon, *Time and Mankind* (18s.); R. M. French, *The Eastern Orthodox Church* (7s. 6d.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: D. W. Langridge, *The Plain Man's Christ* (7s. 6d.); *Congregationalism* [Statement prepared for Faith and Order] (9d.).

MOWBRAY: *The Church Guide for Tourists* (7s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: Maud Bodkin, *Studies of Type-Images in Poetry, Religion and Philosophy* (12s. 6d.); H. H. Rowley (Ed.), *The Old Testament and Modern Study* (25s.).

PATERNOSTER PRESS: G. H. Lang, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (12s. 6d.); A. Rendle Short, *Wonderfully Made* (6s.).

PRESENT QUESTION CONFERENCE: E. W. Hughes, R. W. Latham and Winifred Raphael, *People at Work* (2s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: F. L. Cross (Ed.), *St Cyril of Jerusalem's Lectures on the Christian Sacraments* (12s. 6d.); H. R. T. Brandreth, *An Outline Guide to the Study of Eastern Christendom* (1s. 3d.); H. E. W. Turner, *The Life and Person of Jesus Christ* (1s. 9d.).

TYNDALE PRESS: R. V. G. Tasker, *The Biblical Doctrine of the Wrath of God* (2s.); E. M. Blaiklock, *The Christian in Pagan Society* (2s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher